

6

Remarks

The Examiner has objected to the specification for failing to provide support for the invention as claimed referring specifically to the halogen bulb, a reflector with a black color, and a halogen bulb with an IR coating. In responding thereto, claims 10 and 11 have been cancelled. Claim 13 has been amended to specify that the black color refers to an inner trim bezel. The specification has been amended on pages 4 and 5 to provide support for the halogen bulb recitations as required. Review and acceptance is requested.

Claims 1 through 4, 10 and 12 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Kosmatka '433 or Bradley '748. Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kosmatka '433 or Bradley '748 in view of Bergman '331. Claims 9, 11 and 13 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Kosmatka '433 or Bradley '748 in view of Suzuki '321.

The Examiner has, however, indicated that claims 6 through 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In responding to these rejections, the Applicant has amended claim 1 to specify that a reflecting portion of an inner surface of the headlight reflector comprises a metallic coating having a dark color. Claim 2 has been amended to eliminate the product by process recitations and specify that the metallic coating comprises at least one of chrome, stainless steel

and nickel. Claims 12 and 13 have amended for consistency with claim 1. New claim 14 specifies that the metallic coating is a sputtered coating. Claim 14 recites a structural limitation using functional language, since the properties of the metallic coating depend on the manner in which it is produced. The claims are distinguished from the prior art of record for the following reasons.

The rejections of former claim 1 based on Kosmatka '433 or Bradley '748 are based on the disclosure in column 2 lines 30 through 34 thereof in which the '433 or the '748 reference recite a portion of the reflector surface which is non-reflective. The non-reflectivity is fashioned either by making this portion of the surface transparent or by coating it with a light absorbing material, using for example a non-reflective paint. Reflective portions of the mirror are not modified, rather peripheral regions. The '433 or '748 disclosure therefore fails to read on the invention as now claimed, since the invention specifies that a reflecting portion of the inner surface is treated with a metallic coating to achieve a darkened color. The darkened sections of the prior art due to '433 and '748 disclosures cannot be construed as reflecting, since '433 and '748 strive to achieve surfaces which have as little reflectivity as possible (see in particular '433 column 2 lines 27 through 38).

The invention as claimed provides a vehicle lamp having a completely different appearance than the lamps of prior art, since the metallic coating causes the lamp to have a darkened appearance when the light is not in use, while still having sufficient reflectivity for operation of the lamp. The remaining claims of record inherit the limitations of or include similar recitations as those in claim 1 and are therefore also distinguished from

8

the prior art of record for the reasons given. Review, acceptance and passage to issuance are therefore respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added in this amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Vincent

Dr. Paul Vincent

Registration number 37,461

September 05, 2005

Date

Dreiss, Fuhlendorf, Steimle & Becker
Patentanwälte
Postfach 10 37 62
D-70032 Stuttgart, Germany
Telephone +49-711-24 89 38-0
Fax +49-711-24 89 38-99